

Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

January 23, 2013

9:00 AM – 12:00 PM


Central Valley Regional Water Board





Training Room



11020 Sun Center Drive, #200

Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-6114

Draft Agenda

| | | | |
|----|--|---|--|
| 1. | Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Attachment) Review of agenda and action items. |  DRAFT SC meeting summary 11-20-12v2.doc | 9:00 Brock Bernstein |
| 2. | Information Updates <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sacramento River RMP status and opportunities for coordination (Stephen McCord) 2. Steering Committee updates: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. EPA (Tim Vendlinski) b. Water Supply (Val Connor) | | 9:05 |
| 3. | Decision: Resource Agency Representation A decision is sought on adding DFW/ Resource Agency representation to the SC | | 9:15 Brock Bernstein Gregg Erickson |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|---|
| 4. | <p>Action: Delta RMP Information Item at Regional Board Meeting SC members were in favor of participating in the Delta RMP presentation to the Regional Board</p> <p>Desired Outcome:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree on how SC members will participate 2. Recruit co-presenters | | <p>9:30 Meghan Sullivan</p> |
| 5. | <p>Action: Approval of SC Materials (Attachments) Several materials were revised based on discussions at the 20 November 2012 meeting. In addition, ASC prepared draft criteria for consideration by the SC for selecting TAC members.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sign-in sheets: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. For SC and the designated alternates b. All other meeting participants 2. SC and TAC committee roles 3. Mission statement | <div data-bbox="922 856 987 940"></div> <p>Delta RMP sign-in_template.SC only.v3.2</p> <div data-bbox="930 1077 995 1161"></div> <p>Delta RMP</p> <div data-bbox="922 1234 987 1318"></div> <p>DRAFT Delta RMP Committee Roles 01-10-1</p> <div data-bbox="922 1423 987 1507"></div> <p>DRAFT mission statement v4.1.doc</p> | <p>9:50 Brock Bernstein Thomas Jabusch</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--|---|
| 6. | <p>Action: Management Questions (Attachment) Agreement is sought on the broader questions for the Delta RMP and to use the process of developing management questions from San Francisco Bay Nutrient Management Strategy as an example. ASC staff drafted example management questions and notes (attached) for SC members to discuss internally with their represented groups.</p> <p>Desired Outcome:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree on a process for developing the monitoring questions over the next two months. |  <p>DRAFT core management questions 12-07-1</p> | <p>10:10 Brock Bernstein</p> |
| 7. | <p>Discussion: TAC Suggestions for potential TAC members and discussion of selection criteria for TAC members</p> |  <p>DRAFT Delta RMP TAC Criteria 12-12-12.d</p> | <p>11:30 Brock Bernstein/ SC Representatives</p> |
| 8. | Plus/Delta¹ on today's meeting | | <p>11:55 Brock Bernstein</p> |
| 9. | Confirm date and location for February SC meeting (Feb. 27th) | | <p>11:59 Brock Bernstein</p> |
| 10. | Adjourn | | <p>12:00</p> |

¹ A *Plus/Delta* allows a team, group, or committee quickly to gather feedback from its participants on what it has been doing well and what it could do better. The name, intentionally more positive than Plus/Minus would be, uses delta, the Greek letter that symbolizes change in mathematics, to highlight the team's opportunities for improving how it does its work. The process can take as few as five minutes, i.e. going around the table asking, "What was good/went well in this meeting?" "What can we improve?"

Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

November 20, 2012

9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Building

Sunset Maple Room

10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA 95827

Draft Summary

Attendees:

Steering Committee members present¹:

Casey Wichert, Alternate-POTWs (City of Brentwood)

Dave Tamayo, Alternate-Stormwater, Phase I Communities (City of Sacramento)

Delia McGrath, Stormwater, Phase I Communities (City of Sacramento)

Erich Delmas, Alternate-POTWs (City of Tracy)

Gregg Erickson, Coordinated Monitoring (IEP)

Kenneth Landau, Regulatory – State (Central Valley Regional Water Board)

Linda Dorn, POTWs (SRCSD)

Lynda Smith, Alternate-Water Supply (MWD)

Mike Wackman, Agriculture (Delta & San Joaquin County Water Quality Coalition)

Stephanie Fong, Regulatory – State (Central Valley Regional Water Board)

Tony Pirondini, POTWs (City of Vacaville)

On phone:

Valentina Cabrera, Alternate-Regulatory – Federal (U.S. EPA)

Others present:

Brian Laurenson, LWA

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

¹ Name, Representation (Affiliation)

Bruce Houdesheldt, SVWQC

Cathy Johnson, FWS

Mike Johnson, MLJ-LLC

Jason Lofton, SRCSD

Rainer Hoenicke, ASC

Steve Blecker, DSP

Thomas Jabusch, ASC

Tom Grovhoug, LWA

Vyomini Pandya, SRCSD

On phone:

Anke Mueller-Solger, IEP/DSC

Debbie Webster, CVCWA

Nader Shareghi, Mountain House CSD

| | |
|----|--|
| 1. | Approval of Agenda and Minutes Introduction, established quorum. Notes and minutes were approved. |
| 2. | Categories of SC members Participants discussed and clarified the categories represented by SC members and, in particular, how resource agencies and water purveyors are currently being represented. Linda Dorn noted that the main concern was whether the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) is realistically represented based on the current definition of categories. <u>Decisions</u> 2.1. Revisit the question of adding a “Resource Agency” category, once DFG participation is clarified (see Action Item 8.1). 2.2. Categories for SFWCA and IEP to be named “Water Supply” and “Coordinated Monitoring” 2.3. Identify additional partners once the monitoring questions have been identified |

| | |
|----|---|
| 3. | <p>Steering Committee Representatives</p> <p>Represented parties confirmed their Steering Committee representatives and alternates, with the following changes: Erwin van Nieuwenhuyse (IEP-USBR) will be first alternate and Stephani Spaar (IEP-DWR) will remain second alternate for “Coordinated Monitoring”. The alternate for Stormwater, Phase II still needs to be confirmed.</p> |
| 4. | <p>SC Core Responsibilities and Authorities/ Structure and Roles of the Stakeholder and Technical Advisory Committees</p> <p>Participants discussed a draft paper on the roles of the Steering Committee and the Stakeholder and Technical Advisory Committees. SC members suggested a number of changes, including clarification that a fiscal agent/operating entity, not the SC itself, would fulfill functions such as contracting and payments. Mike Wackman also requested more clarity how the TAC would be staffed. Linda Dorn suggested identifying the core management questions first and then deciding how to staff the TAC. Mike Wackman clarified that he is not so much interested in discussing who’s on the TAC but in how to decide its membership. Rainer Hoenicke suggested that it might be helpful to develop a list of criteria reflecting the desired qualities TAC members can be expected to bring to the table. Brock Bernstein reframed Mike Wackman’s concern as making sure the SC has final authority on TAC membership. Thus, there would be a need to select a TAC chair and alternate chair that are trusted by the SC. A further consideration is the benefits of forming impromptu TACs based on the specific technical issues at hand (appointed through SC and adding more administrative effort) vs. giving the TAC chair and co-chair some more flexibility in organizing the TAC. Delia McGrath suggested as a compromise that the SC could approve a set of core TAC members. She further suggested erring on the side of caution and going with a well-defined structure in the initial phase while trust is being established. Overall, there was agreement to have a balance between a well-defined structure and operational flexibility.</p> <p><u>Decisions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1. First approve the management questions, then form the TAC 4.2. The SC will chose TAC chair and co-chair and select the TAC 4.3. The TAC chair and co-chair will select candidates for the TAC and report back suggestions to the SC |
| 5. | |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>Mission Statement</p> <p>SC members discussed a draft mission statement and provided a number of changes. Linda Dorn noted that the statement is missing mentions of “beneficial uses” and “water quality”</p> |
| 6. | <p>Management Questions</p> <p>Ken Landau identified the biggest concern of the Regional Board as “Are we focusing on the right things? Are we getting the biggest bang for the buck [in terms of implementing policies and control measures]?” Toxicity and pollution effects on the aquatic ecosystem are the priority issues, but this has larger ramifications than just keeping fish healthy. The priority extends to the entire ecosystem and includes nutrients. There is a need for data to inform upcoming decisions, including whether nutrient levels are increasing or decreasing, their impacts on organisms, <i>Microcystis</i> and other blue-green algae, other nutrient impacts on the ecosystem (Delta and beyond), drinking water, and recreation. THMs are also a priority concern.</p> <p>Tony Pirondini requested clarification about whether the Regional Board wants the Delta RMP to focus only on the aquatic ecosystem or also on other issues. Ken Landau replied that in his opinion the Delta RMP should consider other issues and prioritize based on overall importance. Brock Bernstein noted that the task for the SC is to figure out what is important and of interest to start. Ken Landau confirmed that it was Pamela Creedon’s intention to try to have an independent multi-stakeholder group identify the priority issues.</p> <p>Linda Dorn asked SC members and other agencies present to state their interests. FWS is interested in nutrients and pesticides (Cathy Johnson). Steve Blecker (DSC), Brian Laurenson (LWA, stormwater programs), Stephanie Fong (Central Valley Regional Board), Casey Wichert (City of Brentwood), Mike Wackman (DSJWQC), and Erich Delmas (City of Tracy) confirmed interest by their agencies and organizations in nutrients and pesticides. Delia McGrath (City of Sacramento) indicated no strong preference either way on nutrients and pesticides but noted that she wants to see some progress in solving the conundrum of identifying priorities. She further noted that the Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership (SSQP) handles pesticides rather effectively, but that prioritizing pesticides would be a rather good first step and excellent study priority for the RMP. She also noted that there is value in knowing the overall impact of contaminants and figuring out the role of various constituents (Cu, etc.), since the information would be helpful for determining how to change programs to solve an identified problem. Tony Pirondini noted that the Delta RMP would need to be able to leverage sampling that is already being done. Delia McGrath confirmed that efficiency is important. Gregg Erickson confirmed IEP’s interest in nutrients and</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>contaminants, and particularly in the multiple stressors aspect of better understanding these issues. He also noted is important to see status and trends being addressed, but also to understand mechanisms. Dave Tamayo noted the challenge to narrow down a long list of potential chemical analytes to those that are truly causing a known impact. Valentina Cabrera commented that toxicity would be a great integrator. Tony Pirondini noted that there are other things that can be captured in the framework such as hardness, salinity, and pH. Stephanie Fong noted that toxicity monitoring would capture all those parameters by necessity. Delia McGrath commented she was not a huge fan of toxicity testing but that management questions from the San Francisco Bay Nutrient Management Strategy would be a good starting point and to add pesticides. The Delta RMP SC could add other things as desired. Jason Lofton suggested that it would be a good idea to align the development of management questions with the San Francisco Bay Nutrient Management Strategy for mutual benefit. Mike Wackman expressed concern over coordination with the San Francisco Bay Nutrient Management Strategy. He added that it would be great if the parallel effort of developing a monitoring strategy gels into a coordinated effort, but Delta stakeholders need to meet compliance requirements and therefore need to make sure that the Delta RMP meets their own management questions. Brock Bernstein suggested that reviewing the meeting notes would provide perspective on what aspects various groups are interested in, when SC are developing recommendations (see Item 8. Action items).</p> <p><u>Decisions</u></p> <p>6.1. Use process of developing management questions from San Francisco Bay Nutrient Management Strategy as an example (take out “nutrients)</p> |
| 7. | <p>Plus/Delta² on today’s meeting</p> <p>Plus: went better than expected; facilitation; good venue to meet; good open discussion; clear outcomes; half-day; good communication; openness (good for trust-building); beginning of some continuity; opportunity for calling-in</p> <p>Delta: teleconferencing necessary evil; not schedule meeting in week when there’s holidays; discussion got lost in what are our roles/need to bring it back to developing</p> |

² A *Plus/Delta* allows a team, group, or committee quickly to gather feedback from its participants on what it has been doing well and what it could do better. The name, intentionally more positive than Plus/Minus would be, uses delta, the Greek letter that symbolizes change in mathematics, to highlight the team's opportunities for improving how it does its work. The process can take as few as five minutes, i.e. going around the table asking, “What was good/went well in this meeting?” “What can we improve?”

| | |
|----|--|
| | RMP; not developing grandiose themes; need to be well prepared and organized for next meeting; didn't talk about funding |
| 8. | <p>Action items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.1. Gregg Erickson will bring back a response from DFG as to whether they are interested in participating in the SC and RMP and, if so, who their representative would be (due: January 16, 2013) 8.2. ASC staff to change sign-in sheet to add a column identifying SC and the designated alternates that will have a vote at the meeting (due: January 16, 2013) 8.3. ASC staff to amend SC and TAC roles document according to the discussion under item 4 (due: January 16, 2013) 8.4. ASC staff to edit mission statement according to the discussion under item 5 (due: January 16, 2013) 8.5. Based on example management questions and notes, SC members to discuss internally with their represented groups to provide recommendations and figure out how to go forward at the next meeting (due: January 16, 2013) 8.6. SC to wrap-up management questions over the next 2-3 meetings (due: April 1, 2013) 8.7. SC members to provide suggestions for potential TAC members (due: January 16, 2013) 8.8. Regional Board staff to reserve Water Board room (Cal/EAP bldg. or R5, TBD; due: January 16, 2013) |

Delta Regional Monitoring Program – Steering Committee Meeting
Meeting location and address
Date, time

Steering Committee Sign-in Sheet. *If your name is pre-typed below, and your contact information has not changed, please initial next to your name. Please check the field “Designated Vote for Quorum”, if you are attending this meeting as a designated Steering Committee Member or voting alternate (leave blank if not). If your contact information has changed, please update it. Thank you.*

| NAME | | Designated Vote for Quorum? | Category | AFFILIATION | EMAIL | PHONE |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Kenneth Landau | | | Regulatory - | Central Valley Regional Water Board | Ken.Landau@waterboards.ca.gov | (916) 464-4726 |
| Alternates: | | | State | | | |
| Pamela Creedon | | | | | pcreedon@waterboards.ca.gov | (916) 464-4839 |
| Tim Vendlinski | | | Regulatory - | U.S. EPA Region 9 Water Division | vendlinski.tim@epa.gov | (415) 972-3469 |
| Alternate: | | | Federal | | | |
| Valentina Cabrera-Stagno | | | | | cabrera-stagno.valentina@epa.gov | (415) 972-3434 |
| Gregg Erickson | | | Coordinated | Interagency Ecological Program | gerickson@dfg.ca.gov | (209) 942-6071 |
| Alternates: | | | Monitoring | | | |
| Erwin van Nieuwenhuyse | | | | U.S. Bureau of Reclamation | evannieuwenhuyse@usbr.gov | (916) 414-2406 |
| Stephani Spaar | | | | Department of Water Resources | Stephani.Spaar@water.ca.gov | (916) 376-9703 |
| Delia McGrath | | | Stormwater, | City of Sacramento | dmcgrath@cityofsacramento.org | (916) 808-5390 |
| Alternate: | | | Phase I | | | |
| Dave Tamayo | | | | County of Sacramento | tamayod@SacCounty.net | (916) 874-8024 |
| Brandon Nakagawa | | | Stormwater, | San Joaquin County | bnakagawa@sjgov.org | (209) 953-7460 |
| Alternate: | | | Phase II | | | |
| TBD | | | | | | |
| Linda Dorn | | | POTWs | Sacramento RCSD | dornl@sacsewer.com | (916) 876-6030 |

Delta Regional Monitoring Program – Steering Committee Meeting
Meeting location and address
Date, time

Steering Committee Sign-in Sheet. *If your name is pre-typed below, and your contact information has not changed, please initial next to your name. Please check the field “Designated Vote for Quorum”, if you are attending this meeting as a designated Steering Committee Member or voting alternate (leave blank if not). If your contact information has changed, please update it. Thank you.*

| NAME | | Designated Vote for Quorum? | Category | AFFILIATION | EMAIL | PHONE |
|-------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--------------|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tony Pirondini | | | | City of Vacaville | TPirondini@cityofvacaville.com | (707) 469-6439 |
| Jeff Willett | | | | City of Stockton | Jeff.Willett@stocktongov.com | (209) 937-8734 |
| Alternates: | | | | | | |
| Debbie Webster | | | | Central Valley Clean Water Association | eofficer@cvcwa.org | (530) 268-1338 |
| Erich Delmas | | | | City of Tracy | erichd@ci.tracy.ca.us | (209) 831-4488 |
| Casey Wichert | | | | City of Brentwood | cwichert@brentwoodca.gov | (925) 516-6060 |
| Nader Shareghi | | | | Mountain House Community Services District | Nshareghi@sjgov.org | (209) 831-5607 |
| Jenny Skrel | | | | Ironhouse Sanitary District | skrelisd@sbcglobal.net | (925) 516-6060 |
| Jason Lofton | | | | Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District | loftonj@sacsewer.com | (916) 876-6008 |
| Vyomini Pandya | | | | | pandyav@sacsewer.com | (916) 876-6677 |
| Mike Wackman | | | Agriculture | San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition | michaelkw@msn.com | 209-472-7127 ext. 125 |
| Alternate: | | | | | | |
| Bruce Houdesheldt | | | | Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition | bruceh@norcalwater.org | (916) 442-8333 |
| Val Connor | | | Water Supply | State and Federal Water Contractors Agency | VConnor@sfcwa.org | (916) 476-5053 |
| Alternate: | | | | | | |
| Stephanie Fong | | | | State and Federal Water Contractors Agency | sfong@sfcwa.org | (916) 400-4840 |

Delta Regional Monitoring Program – Steering Committee Meeting
Meeting location and address
Date, time

[illegible]

Steering Committee

The core responsibilities and authorities of the Steering Committee (SC) are to determine the overall budget, allocate program funds, track progress, and provide direction to the Program from a manager's perspective. The SC will meet quarterly.

The Delta RMP Steering Committee is the key decision-making authority of the Delta RMP. The Steering Committee is responsible for establishing the RMP's strategic direction and the policies and procedures that govern its operation. The Steering Committee may direct RMP staff and/or advisory committees to assist in meeting the RMP's objectives and may delegate the day-to-day functions of the RMP to the RMP's implementing entity.

The Steering Committee shall have the authority to implement any agreements among the participating members and, specifically, to:

1. Direct the fiscal/operating agent to request and receive federal, state, local, and private funds from any source and to expend those moneys to accomplish the Delta RMP's goals
2. Approve budgets and expenditures
3. Direct the fiscal/operating agent to enter into partnerships, contracts, and other legal agreements on behalf of the Delta RMP, as necessary to fulfill the Delta RMP's mission
4. Approve Delta RMP work products and any other plans, products, or resolutions of the Delta RMP
5. Set priorities and oversee the activities of the Stakeholder and Technical Advisory Committees
6. Establish and oversee the implementation of policies and procedures necessary to the day-to-day functioning of the Delta RMP

Membership on the Steering Committee will not diminish the regulatory responsibilities or authority of any participating agency or organization.

Technical Advisory Committee

Under direction of the Steering Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) provides oversight of the technical content and quality of the RMP. It consists of technical representatives from the RMP membership groups, with technical support from Delta RMP staff. The Technical Advisory Committee will meet as needed, at a minimum quarterly.

The responsibilities of the TAC are to assist the Steering Committee in developing, reviewing, and revising the Delta RMP's monitoring and special studies priorities in line with the management questions; report to the Steering Committee on technical issues as requested by Steering Committee members and develop white papers where appropriate; select and convene *ad hoc* subcommittees or workgroups to provide guidance on specific issues, with members drawn from both within and outside the TAC, as needed to include appropriate and/or specialized scientific or technical expertise not fully represented on the TAC; to provide guidance on specific issues; provide review and recommendations to the Steering Committee on select project proposals that are technical in nature or have a strong technical component; and to provide review and recommendations to the Steering Committee on select policies being considered for adoption that are technical in nature or have a strong technical component; and to develop and/or contribute to the annual Pulse of the Delta report.

The TAC consists of experts in estuarine science and related fields who are able to provide scientific opinions on a broad range of subject areas related to the Delta RMP's activities. TAC members should have a working familiarity with the current scientific knowledge in their field. TAC members may be drawn from the organizations represented on the Steering Committee but are not limited to these. They may be drawn from a variety of sectors, e.g. academia, NGOs,

government agencies, but they function as individuals and disinterested scientific experts, not as representatives of their sectors or individual institutions. The TAC may convene appropriate science advisory panels and /or independent experts to provide science advice on specific projects, initiatives, reports, and studies. Finally, TAC members are able to work collaboratively to examine technical issues and develop advice and recommendations for the Steering Committee.

Membership on the TAC is for a two-year term. SC members cannot also serve on the TAC. The number of terms served by an individual is not limited but membership on the TAC must be renewed. Once the TAC is established, the TAC members will work with Delta RMP staff to nominate new (or existing) members for approval by the Steering Committee. The members of the TAC will appoint a Chair for a two-year term¹. A qualified Chair has a broad understanding of scientific issues in the Delta and can provide strong leadership and direction to the group.

ASC staff and Regional Board staff will provide the communication link between the SC and the TAC.

Other Stakeholders

All meetings of the Delta RMP Steering Committee are public. Stakeholders that are not RMP participants will have the opportunity to weigh in by participating in meetings and providing additional project and product review. Other stakeholders may also participate in specific technical workgroups.

¹ The exception is the first chair, who is going to be selected by the SC and will then fill out the TAC.

DRAFT Delta RMP Mission Statement

The primary goal of the Delta RMP is to provide coordinated Deltawide monitoring, reporting, and assessment of contaminants. A secondary goal is to improve the efficiency of water quality data collection and management in the Delta. The program's mission is to support decisions and inform the prioritization of actions intended to protect, and where necessary, restore beneficial uses of water in the Delta, by developing objective scientific information critical to understanding regional water quality conditions and trends.

DRAFT Delta RMP Core Management Questions

The Delta RMP SC tasked ASC staff to draft example core management questions for review and internal discussions with their constituent groups, using the management questions from the [San Francisco Bay Nutrient Management Strategy](#) as a template. The resulting core management questions are presented below as an option for consideration (i.e., a “strawman”). The SC also agreed that these generic core questions will then provide a basis for developing more specific and detailed questions that will provide the basis for monitoring and assessment designs, focusing on nutrients and pesticides as the initial priorities. The process for deciding on the core questions and how to move forward from there to developing more specific monitoring questions for nutrients and pesticides will be decision points for the upcoming meeting on January 23.

When we worked on making the nutrient management questions for the draft SF Bay Management Strategy more generic, we noticed that the resulting questions are very similar to the Core Questions for the Delta RMP that had been previously floated for review and consideration. Therefore, these Delta RMP questions are presented here again for comparison and as an option for consideration. The questions derived from the SF Bay Nutrient Management Strategy are slightly more explicit and could be interpreted as monitoring questions derived from the Delta RMP Core Questions. The similarity is not just coincidental: both sets of questions (Nutrient Management Questions for SF Bay and Delta RMP Core Questions Version 1.1) have been derived from the core management questions that guide the San Francisco Bay RMP. And these questions are similar to (and have been mutually influenced by) questions driving monitoring in other regions (e.g., SWAMP, the Southern California Bight Program). In essence, there seem to be some general types of information water quality managers are typically interested in, with some slightly nuanced differences depending on the particular resource and management setting.

| Type | Management Question |
|---|---|
| Water Quality Guidelines | What are appropriate guidelines for identifying a contaminant-related problem? |
| Status and trends | <p>Is there a problem or are there signs of a problem?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is water quality currently, or trending towards, adversely affecting beneficial uses of the Delta? b. Are contaminants (e.g. pesticides or nutrients) impairing beneficial uses in subregions of the Delta? c. Are trends similar or different across different subregions of the Delta? |
| Sources, Pathways, Loadings, and Processes (e.g. transformations) | <p>Which pollutant sources and processes are most important to understand and quantify?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Which pathways, sources, loadings, and pathways contribute most to impacts? b. What is the relative contribution of each source (municipal wastewater, upstream inputs, NPS, etc.)? c. What are contributions of internal sources (e.g. benthic fluxes) from sediments and sinks to the Delta contaminant budgets? |
| Forecasting | What contaminant loads can the Delta assimilate without impairment of beneficial uses? |
| | What is the likelihood that the Delta will be water quality-impaired in the future? |

PROPOSED CORE QUESTIONS FOR THE DELTA RMP

THE PROPOSED CORE QUESTIONS AND ASSOCIATED MONITORING QUESTIONS OF THE DELTA RMP.

STRAW CORE QUESTION 1:

Are contaminants in the Delta potentially at levels of concern?

Associated Monitoring Question 1-1.

What is the spatial and temporal distribution of contaminants?

Associated Monitoring Question 1-2.

What are appropriate water quality guidelines?

Associated Monitoring Question 1-3.

Are there particular regions of concern?

STRAW CORE QUESTION 2:

What are the sources, pathways, loadings, and processes leading to water quality impacts in the Delta?

Associated Monitoring Question 2-1.

Which sources, pathways, loadings, and processes contribute most to impacts?

Associated Monitoring Question 2-2.

What are the effects of management actions?

STRAW CORE QUESTION 3:

What are the projected water quality conditions and associated impacts in the Delta?

Associated Monitoring Question 3-1.

What is the water quality forecast under various management scenarios?

Here is an initial draft of criteria the Steering Committee may want to use to appoint TAC members:

1. Representation from Steering Committee member organizations with scientific expertise in environmental monitoring design, contaminant fate and transport, environmental toxicology, water resource management, ecosystem processes and functions, geochemistry, data analysis/modeling, or similar fields.
2. Deep understanding of environmental monitoring and assessment approaches and application of information in various management and decision-making contexts.